

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 18-23, 28-30, and 35-37 are pending in the Application. Claims 8-17, 24-27, 31-34, and 38-41 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 5, 18, 21, 28, and 35 have been amended. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and in other applications.

Claims 1, 5, 18, 21, 28, and 35 have been amended to highlight at least one of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited art. Claims 1, 5, 18, 21, 28, and 35 have not been amended to overcome any cited art.

Claims 1-7, 18-23, 28-30, and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gillingham et al (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20020015348) (“Gillingham”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a content addressable memory (CAM) cell, comprising “a matchline; a wordline; and a shieldline positioned between said matchline and said wordline for shielding electrical noise from said matchline, said shieldline being electrically separate from said matchline.”

Gillingham discloses a “system and method for reduction of power consumed by a searchline buffer and control circuit during a CAM search-and-compare operation.” (Gillingham, Abstract)

Gillingham fails to disclose or suggest “a shieldline positioned between said matchline and said wordline for shielding electrical noise from said matchline, said shieldline being electrically separate from said matchline.” To the contrary, Gillingham’s “shieldline”, TL, is connected to Gillinham’s matchline, rather than being “positioned between said matchline and said wordline” and “being electrically separate from said matchline” as in the claimed invention. (Gillingham, ¶ [0040]). Further, Gillingham’s “shieldline”, TL, is connected to Gillinham’s matchline and, depending on the state of the n-channel transistor shares the signal carried on the matchline. The “shieldline” of the

claimed invention, is not connected from the matchline and is adapted to receive electrical noise from the matchline. As such, the “shieldline” of Gillingham is different from the “shieldline” of the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection to claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and incorporate, directly and indirectly, all the limitations thereof and are allowable for at least the reason noted above.

Claims 5-7, 18-23, 28-30, and 35-37 are similar to claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reason noted above.

Claims 4 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious under Gillingham. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 4 and 20 are similar to claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reason noted above.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Michael A. Weinstein

Registration No.: 53,754

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant